1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

deposition.

TLER MENDELSON

- 3. As G-P had stated in the Joint Case Management Statement, I told Ms. Dickson that G-P intended to oppose any motion to intervene, and that the deposition should be continued until such motion was decided by the Court. The deposition noticed for January 9, 2008, was, therefore, taken off calendar.
- 4. At Stege's request, based on Ms. Dickson's unavailability due to a trial, G-P agreed to stipulate to continue the hearing on Stege's motion to intervene ("Motion") to April 1, 2008. The Court granted Stege's request for a continuance by order filed February 19, 2008.
- 5. As of March 18, 2008, when Stege filed her Reply brief in support of her Motion, the parties anticipated that Stege's Motion would be resolved on or around the hearing on April 1, 2008. Thus, the parties had agreed on Stege's deposition for April 7 and 8, 2008 at a premediation teleconference.
- 6. On April 3, 2008, not knowing whether Stege's Motion the reason that Stege's deposition was originally taken off calendar would be granted, I proposed to EEOC attorney Linda Ordonio-Dixon that the parties continue Stege's deposition to later in April, as follows:

As the court has taken the motion to intervene under submission, and we have no ruling, we believe that it would be premature to proceed with the deposition of Ms. Stege on Monday and Tuesday of next week. I'd like to propose that we try to reschedule the deposition for April 21 and 22, in the hope that we have a ruling by then, one way or the other, and we can get the deposition before the mediation on April 24, 2008. Will those dates work for you? If not, please give me alternative dates.

The EEOC notified me that it was not possible to conduct the deposition on April 21 and 22, so as to complete the deposition before the mediation.

7. On April 8, 2008, I requested that Ms. Ordonio-Dixon agree to set Stege's deposition for April 24 and 25, 2008, and that the parties stipulate to a 30-day extension to complete mediation. (Stege was not yet a party to the action). On April 9, 2008, the Court issued its Order granting Stege's Motion. Also on April 9, Ms. Ordonio-Dixon was informed me that Plaintiffs' were apparently insisting that the mediation go forward without Ms. Stege's deposition, which we had all previously agreed was necessary to a productive mediation. I then informed Ms. Ordonio-

Document 46

Filed 04/10/2008

Page 3 of 3

Case 4:07-cv-03944-SBA